
REMARKS:

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 51, and 52 have been cancelled. Claims 5-9, 11, 21-25, 27, and 32-47 were previously cancelled. Claims 2-4, 10, 12, 13-20, 26, 28-31, and 48-50 are presently pending. Claim 13 has been rewritten in independent form. Claims 2-4, 10, and 12 have been amended to depend from claim 13. Claims 15 and 30 have been amended to correct typographical errors. Claims 13, 16, 48, 49, and 50 are independent.

In the Office Action, claim 51 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Claim 51 has been cancelled.

In the Office Action of June 15, 2004, claims 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, based on the use of the term "near-" in claim 1, which claims 13-15 depended from. In the current Office Action, it was indicated that claims 13-15 would be allowable if they were rewritten to overcome this rejection and were also rewritten to "include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims." (Office Action, pg. 6). In the Amendment of October 15, 2004, claim 1 was amended to eliminate the term "near-". Claim 13 has been rewritten to independent form by including the limitations of claim 1 as amended. Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 13. Accordingly, the applicants assert that claims 13-15 should now be in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 12, 51, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Subramaniam et al. (U.S. 5,907,075). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Subramaniam et al. in view of McClure et al. (U.S. 4,056,578). Claims 1, 51, and 52 have been cancelled. Claims 2-4, 10, and 12 have been rewritten to depend from allowable claim 13. "If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious." MPEP § 2143.03. Since claim 13, as amended, was noted as being allowable, amended claims 2-4, 10, and 12 should be found nonobvious and therefore allowable. Accordingly, applicants assert that this rejection has been overcome and that claims 2-4,

Serial No. 09/940,015
Amendment dated February 24, 2005
Reply to Office Action of January 11, 2005

Docket No. 31888

10, and 12 are now in condition for allowance.

In the Office Action, claims 16-20, 26, 28-31, and 48-50 were allowed.

In view of the foregoing, the present application appears to be in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

Any additional fee which is due in connection with this amendment should be applied against our Deposit Account No. 19-0522.

Respectfully submitted,

HOVEY WILLIAMS, LLP

By



Tracey S. Truitt, Reg. No. 43,205
2405 Grand Boulevard, Suite 400
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
816/474-9050

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT(S)